



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,629	12/19/2001	Robert Alexander Mann	12560-US	9206

23553 7590 04/07/2006

MARKS & CLERK
P.O. BOX 957
STATION B
OTTAWA, ON K1P 5S7
CANADA

EXAMINER

MITCHELL, JASON D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2193

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/021,629

Applicant(s)

MANN ET AL.

Examiner

Jason Mitchell

Art Unit

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19-24, 26 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 19-24, 26 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to an amendment filed 1/17/06.

Claims 1-14, 16-17, 19, and 20-24 have been amended. Claims 1-17, 19-24 and 26-27 are pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

It is noted that Applicant has requested the withdrawal of claim 16. This claim is not under a restriction requirement so withdraw is inappropriate, further Applicant has submitted amendments to the claim. Consequently claim 16 will be treated as amended and addressed below.

Applicant's arguments on pp. 34-39 regarding the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claim 1 have been fully considered but were not persuasive.

Starting in the first paragraph on pg. 36, Applicant states:

In contrast, Haggerty does not teach a single managed entity object class run-time derivable via run-time parsed entity directives from a file, ... The Examiner has characterized Haggerty's Managed Object base object as being the single managed entity object class. However, Haggerty's Managed Object base object is not run-time derivable based on directives parsed from a file.

...

Clearly, by referring to multiple topology objects and to an abstract set of objects which model basic types of network topology object, Haggerty teaches the pre-compilation of a multitude of object types, albeit derived from Haggerty's Managed Object, where only the topology objects are further derivable.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. First, the phrase 'an abstract set of objects' indicates that the set is not fixed (pre-compiled) but changeable and adaptable throughout it's lifetime and (able to be derived).

Further, as was mentioned in the rejection, Haggerty discloses that 'The topology objects are created through OpenView Map additions to the MOM or by auto discovery' (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2), and OpenView clearly teaches the Autodiscovery process occurring at run-time and includes a derivation step (pg. 5-7 Managing the SNMP Manager Database 'Manage Database accesses a compiler that adds MIBs to the Manager's database').

In the paragraph bridging pp.36 and 37, Applicant states:

It is respectfully submitted that the auto discovery and OpenView Map additions to the MOM as described cause the instantiation of Haggerty's topology objects in the MOM, which is equivalent to our description at paragraph [60] wherein the containment hierarchy maintained by the managed object server is populated with managed object instances corresponds to field installed network entities.

Applicant's amended paragraph [60] states:

In accordance with the exemplary embodiment of the invention, the interaction between the software applications 210 and the managed object type instances 206, changes the data network state and/or provides an update of the data network state by making use of the enabling technologies 230. Instantiation of the managed object types (300) is performed subsequent to the discovery of physical managed entities in the realm of influence of the network management and service provisioning solution. Discovery of physical managed entities is provided via client software application 210 such as but not limited to the inventory reporting software application 214. The instantiation of managed entity object types may also be a result of the interaction of an analyst with the NMS 130 via the client software applications 210. The instantiated manageable entity object types define a managed object type containment hierarchy 500 presented in FIG. 5.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. First if Haggerty's 'OpenView Map additions to the MOM' are to be considered equivalent to populating the containment hierarchy, then they would include an 'Instantiation of the managed object types (300)' (Applicant's par. [60]). Thus implying the existence of a 'Single Class Type Derivation Hierarchy 300'.

Further, it would appear that Applicant's 'Single Class Types Derivation Hierarchy' is primarily a hierarchy of class definitions derived from a base class. (Applicant's par. [36] 'The single managed entity class is used, via type derivation, to define a single-class type derivation hierarchy 300 of (concrete) manageable object types.') Such a feature is clearly anticipated by Haggerty's disclosure on pg. 76, in the last paragraph of the second column. ('All objects in the model derive from one base object called a Managed Object.')

Still Further, turning to Applicant's Fig. 2 it can be seen that the Containment Hierarchy 500 (Haggerty's MOM) is populated by Managed Entity Object Instances 206 (Haggerty's 'topology objects'), which are instantiations 202 of the Single Class Types form the Derivation Hierarchy 300 (Haggerty's 'base inheritance structure'; Fig. 4).

Thus, it is Examiners position that Haggerty discloses the limitations in question.

In the first paragraph on pg. 38, Applicant states:

Haggerty also fails to teach managed data network entity specification files including directives, a directive parser parsing directives from managed data network entity specification files at run-time, a generic lexical analyzer interpreting, at run-time, directives parsed from a managed data network entity specification file, the executable code implementation of the invoked function configured to cause the execution of an operation specified via a directive in a managed data network entity specification file at run-time via a function call to the invoke function using the name of the operation as a parameter to the invoke function.

Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Art Unit: 2193

Applicant has merely stated that the cited art does not teach certain limitations of the claim, but has not provided any evidence or argument in support of the statement which would indicate how Haggerty fails to teach the limitations.

In the paragraph bridging pp. 38 and 39 Applicant states:

[T]he CORBA reference fails to teach polymorphic operations defined at run-time via the registration of an operation name with a dictionary of operation in accordance with a corresponding operation directive specified in a managed data network entity specification file. ... However the CORBA reference at Section 10.3.1 describes the real-time manipulation of type information in interface repositories. Interface Repositories are defined in the CORBA reference in Section 10.1 wherein *"The interface Repository ... managed and provides access to a collection of object definitions."* Clearly, the Interface Repository defined in the CORBA reference corresponds to the managed object server 240 of the present application and not to the dictionary of operations 330.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. As noted by Applicant CORBA teaches *"The interface Repository ... managed and provides access to a collection of object definitions"*

(Section 10.1). As can be seen in section 10.4.3 'Interface Repository Objects, an interface definition "contains lists of ... operations" and thus, in conjunction with the teachings of Haggerty, suggests the claimed dictionary of operations by providing a list of method names associated with the objects.

Based on the discussion above, Examiner is maintaining the rejection of claim 1 and similar claims 11 and 12

Applicant's arguments on pp. 37 regarding Hagardy's 'Naming Service' have been considered but are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

Applicant's arguments on pp. 39-40 regarding the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claims 3 and 4 have been considered but are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

Specification

The amendment filed 1/17/06 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention.

Among other things, Examiner could find no support for the amendment to paragraph [17]. Specifically the disclosure

The single management entity object class implementation further includes an executable code implementation of an invoke function configured to cause the execution of at least one operation having a name via a function call to the invoke function using the name of the operation as a parameter to the invoke function ...And, a message interpreter processes messages received from at least one network management and service provisioning software application at run-time by calling the invoke function to cause the execution of a registered operation on an instance of a derived managed data network object type by using the corresponding operation name as a parameter of the invoke function. A separation is achieved between managed data network entity instances and network management and service provisioning software application.

Further, the amendment to claim 5 recites:

[the] specification file comprises at least one executable code implementation of a named operation.

Examiner could find no disclosure of the specification file containing any executable code. Further such a limitation would seem to contradict Applicant's disclosure that the files are 'human-readable'

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first and second paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claim recites a specification file which comprises an 'executable code implementation of a named operation'. Examiner could find no disclosure of the specification file being executable or containing executable code.

Claim 5 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

It is unclear how the human readable specification file, which is parsed and lexically analyzed, also contains executable code. Parsing and Lexical analysis are generally applied to text.

Claims 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for using terms which lack antecedent basis.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "at least one attribute directive" in lines 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 9 recites the limitation "The managed data network entity specification" in 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 5-15, 17, 19-24 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "The Benefits of CORBA-Based Network Management" by Haggerty and Seetharaman (Haggerty) in view of "HP OpenView for Windows User Guide" (OpenView) further in view of "The Common Object Request Broker: Architecture and Specification" (CORBA).

Regarding Claims 1 and 11-12: Haggerty discloses (c.) an executable code implementation of a single managed entity object class (pg. 76, col. 2, par. 5 'All objects in the model derive from one base object called a Managed Object'), the single managed entity object class being run-time derivable via type derivation (pg. 76, col. 1,

par. 2 'The topology objects are created through OpenView Map additions to the MOM or by auto discovery'); into a derivation hierarchy of managed data network object types based on run-time parsed entity directives, (Fig. 4) the single management entity object class implementation further comprising an executable code implementation configured to cause the execution of at least one operation having a name (pg. 76, col. 2, par. 5 'defines base attributes and operations for all objects') a dictionary of operations providing run-time support for polymorphic operation invocation (pg. 75 col. 1 'resolve the name to determine the object reference'); and ; (e.) a message interpreter processing messages received from at least one network management and service provisioning software application (pg. 78, col. 2, par. 2 'integrates with OpenView') at runtime execution of a registered operation on an instance of a derived managed data network object type (pg. 78, col. 2, par. 2 'By using CORBA'); wherein a separation is achieved between managed data network entity instances, and network management and service provisioning software applications (Fig. 3), the separation enabling independent development, maintenance and troubleshooting in providing network management and service provisioning (pg. 79, col. 1, par. 1 'ProSphere network management system ... leads to an extremely open, extensible and distributed solution') and the run-time derivation of the single managed entity object class and invoking the operation by name minimizing the need to re-code and recompile code in supporting new managed entity object types (pg. 77, col. 1, par. 1 'adding support for new equipment requires only creating a new object definition, which fits into the model').

Art Unit: 2193

Haggerty does not explicitly disclose a parser/lexical analyzer for processing managed data network entity specification/directives, but does disclose that 'The topology objects are created through OpenView Map additions to the MOM or by Auto discovery'. (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2)

OpenView teaches that its auto discovery feature reads a 'Management Information Base (MIB) file' (pg. 1-7 SNMP Manager) to retrieve data regarding the device (pg. 1-7 SNMP Manager 'The Device settings and other device information ... are defined ... in a ... MIB').

Parsing and Lexical analysis are both fundamental steps required to load a datafile in the manner described (p 5-17 'adds MIB's to the Manager's database'). Thus it can be seen that Haggerty necessarily incorporates a 'parser/lexical analyzer for processing managed data network entity specification/directives'.

Further Haggerty does not explicitly disclose polymorphic operation invocation or use of a call to an 'invoke' function which takes an operation name as a parameter, but does disclose the use of CORBA (pg. 75, col. 1, par. 5).

CORBA teaches a dictionary of operations holding a roster of operation names of operations registered with the dictionary of operations (4.3.1.1 get interface) each registered operation referencing a method associated with the managed data network object type (10.4.3 Interface Repository Objects 'InterfaceDef: an interface definition; it contains lists of ... operations'); run time support for polymorphic operation invocation (Section 9.2.3.7 'The copy operation ... is polymorphic'; and Section 10.3.1 'Interface

Art Unit: 2193

repositories ... manipulate the type information at run time'); and an 'invoke' function which takes an operation name as a parameter (7.2.1 create_request; 7.2.3 invoke)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use CORBA's ORB (4.3.1.1 get interface) in conjunction with Haggerty's Naming Service (4.3.1.1 get interface) to provide a dictionary of operations in accordance with a run-time parsed operation directive in respect of a corresponding managed data network object type (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2 'OpenView Map additions to the MOM or by Auto discovery') and to incorporate polymorphism into Haggerty's system in order to provide more a more flexible configuration management tool (pg. 74, col. 1, par. 7 'provide customers with an easy means to configure and monitor GDC equipment') and to implement Haggerty's "IDL interface that defines base ... operation for all objects" using the techniques taught in CORBA.

Regarding Claim 2: The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further Haggerty does not explicitly disclose the derivation of a managed data network object type includes the specification of at least one attribute. However he does disclose that the object being derived from the specification allows for attributes (pg. 77, col. 1, par. 1 'the derived objects ... implement most of their properties and functions').

OpenView teaches a specification which includes at least on attribute (pg. 1-7 SNMP Manager 'The Device settings and other device information ... are defined ... in a ... MIB')

Accordingly it would therefore have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include specification of at least one attribute in the specification.

Regarding Claim 6: The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further while Haggerty does not explicitly disclose at least one attribute directive includes an attribute specification, he does disclose that the object being derived from the specification allows for attributes (pg. 77, col. 1, par. 1 'the derived objects ... implement most of their properties and functions').

OpenView teaches an attribute directive includes an attribute specification (pg. 1-7 SNMP Manager 'The Device settings and other device information ... are defined ... in a ... MIB')

Accordingly it would therefore have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include at least one directive specifying of at least one attribute.

Regarding Claim 7: The rejection of claim 6 is incorporated; further while Haggerty does not explicitly disclose the attribute specification further specifies managed data network object type inheritance, he does disclose that the object being derived from the specification allows for inheritance (pg. 77, col. 1, par. 1 'higher level objects implement most of their properties and functions'). It would therefore have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further specify managed data network object type inheritance.

Regarding Claim 8: The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses A plug-in registry for run-time registration of at least one plug-in brokering access to network management and service provisioning enabling technologies (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2 'The topology objects are created through OpenView Map additions to the MOM'), the network management and service provisioning enabling technologies include support for at least one of a persistence method and a persistence entity (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2 'The topology objects ... contain information pertaining to addressing, type, uniqueness, resources, and status').

Regarding Claim 9: The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses the managed data network entity specification file further comprises a command sequence directive specifying a command sequence to be followed in using a specific registered enabling technology (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2 'The topology objects ... contain information pertaining to addressing, type, uniqueness, resources, and status').

Regarding Claim 10: The rejection of claim 9 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses the framework further comprising at least one registered enabling-technology-specific lexical analyzer stub for interpreting at least one enabling-technology-specific directive (pg. 78, col. 1, par. 1 'The ProSphere user interfaces use the compiled stubs from IDL to interact with the objects').

Regarding Claim 13: The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses processing the at least one received message, the method comprises a further step of populating a containment hierarchy of managed data network object type instances at run-time corresponding to field installed data network equipment (Fig. 4).

Regarding Claim 14: The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses run-time registering at run-time with a plug-in registry at least one plug-in brokering access to at least on network management and service provisioning enabling technology (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2 'The topology objects are created through OpenView Map additions to the MOM').

Regarding Claim 15: The rejection of claim 14 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses wherein run-time registering the at least one plug-in, the method further comprises a prior step of: selecting the at least one plug-in for registration thereof (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2 'The topology objects are created through OpenView Map additions to the MOM').

While Haggerty does not explicitly disclose selecting the at least one plug-in for registration thereof, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a user with the ability to select the at least one plug-in for registration thereof, instead of having to re-define the managed data network entity prior to adding it to the MOM.

Regarding Claim 16: The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses a step of: run-time loading the at least one managed data network entity specification file (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2 'The topology objects are created through OpenView Map additions to the MOM').

Regarding Claim 17: The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses run-time loading the at least one managed data network entity specification, the method further comprises a prior step of: selecting the at least one managed data

Art Unit: 2193

network entity specification file (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2 'The topology objects are created through OpenView Map additions to the MOM').

While Haggerty does not explicitly disclose selecting the at least one managed data network entity specification, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a user with the ability to select the at least one managed data network entity specification instead of having to re-define the managed data network entity prior to adding it to the MOM.

Regarding Claim 19: The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses wherein deriving the single managed entity object class via type derivation, the method further comprises a step of setting at least one attribute (pg. 77, col. 1, par. 1 'the derived objects ... implement most of their properties and functions').

Regarding Claim 20: The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses wherein prior to processing the at least one message received from the at least one software application, the method further comprises a step of: registering the at least one software application with the network management and service provisioning computing environment framework (Fig. 2, ProSphere Application Objects').

Regarding Claim 21: The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses wherein processing the at least one received message; the method further comprises a step of: implementing a directive specified in the at least one managed data network entity specification file using a lexical analyzer stub associated with a corresponding plug-in (pg. 78, col. 1, par. 1 'The ProSphere user interfaces use the compiled stubs from IDL to interact with the objects').

Regarding Claim 22: the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses wherein implementing the directive, the method further comprises a step of: deriving a containment hierarchy by instantiating managed data network object type (pg. 76, col. 1, par. 2 'The topology objects are created through OpenView Map additions to the MOM').

Regarding Claim 23: The rejection of claim 21 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses wherein implementing the directive the method further comprises a step of: effecting a change in a network state of a managed data transport network in a realm of management (pg. 78, col. 1, par. 1 'The ProSphere user interfaces use the compiled stubs from IDL to interact with the objects').

Regarding Claim 24: The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses wherein subsequent to processing the at least one message received by the framework; the method further comprises a step of: sending a message to the software application (pg. 78, col. 2, par. 2 'integrates with OpenView').

Regarding Claim 26: The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses making a dictionary entry in the dictionary of operations, (pg. 75, col. 1, par. 5 'provides the ability to bind a name to an object reference').

Regarding Claim 27: The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated; further Haggerty discloses wherein making the dictionary entry in the dictionary, the method further comprises a step of using name spaces techniques to associate each operation name with a corresponding derived managed data network object type with corresponding

Art Unit: 2193

registered methods (pg. 75, col. 1, par. 5 'provides the ability to bind a name to an object reference').

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "The Benefits of CORBA-Based Network Management" by Haggerty and Seetharaman (Haggerty) in view of "The Common Object Request Broker: Architecture and Specification" (CORBA) and further in view of US 6,058,445 to Chari et al. (Chari).

Regarding Claim 3: The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated further the Haggerty-OpenView-CORBA combination does not explicitly teach the managed data network entity specification file includes at least one human readable file. However the OpenView reference does teach a managed data network entity specification file (pg. 1-7 SNMP Manager 'The Device settings and other device information ... are defined ... in a ... MIB').

Chari teaches 'MIBs are formally described using an abstract syntax notation set out in ISO 8824' (col. 10, lines 64-67; also see cols. 11-80).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time to write OpenView's MIB files (pg. 1-7 SNMP Manager 'The Device settings and other device information ... are defined ... in a ... MIB') human readable as taught in Chari in order to adhere to the standard (col. 10, lines 64-67).

Regarding Claim 4: The rejection of claim 3 is incorporated further; OpenView teaches that each human-readable file is an attribute file holding attributes (pg. 1-7 SNMP

Art Unit: 2193

Manager 'The Device settings and other device information ... are defined ... in a ... MIB').

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Mitchell whose telephone number is (571) 272-3728. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571) 272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jason Mitchell
3/30/06



KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100